

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FRED GOBER, on behalf of	)	Case No. CV 15-07120 DDP (PLAx)
himself and all other	)	
similarly situated,	)	<b>ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION</b>
	)	<b>FOR A MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT AND</b>
Plaintiff,	)	<b>VACATING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR</b>
	)	<b>EXTENSION OF TIME</b>
v.	)	
	)	[Dkt. Nos. 26, 28]
WELLS FARGO & COMPANY and	)	
WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,	)	
Defendants.	)	

Presently before the Court are Defendants' Motion for a More Definite Statement (dkt. no. 26), and Plaintiff's Motion for an Extension of Time to File Response to Defendants' Motion (dkt. no. 28). After reviewing the Parties' submissions, the Court DENIES Defendants' Motion and VACATES as moot Plaintiff's Motion.

Defendants' Motion claims that Plaintiff's Complaint fails to "plead basic facts about the contract or the breach," including by "not identify[ing] any specific document that might constitute a contract." (Dkt. no. 26, at 1.) Defendants claim that Plaintiff's theory of liability is unclear in the Complaint and so Defendants cannot properly respond to the Complaint. (Id. at 4.) Defendants

1 say Plaintiff might be claiming breach of a loan application, or  
2 perhaps an approved loan application, or even some other,  
3 unspecified communications; it is unclear to Defendants based on  
4 the allegations in the Complaint. (Id. at 4-5.)

5 In response, Plaintiff alleged that he lacked the evidence  
6 needed to properly answer Defendants' Motion, which he believed was  
7 in Defendants' possession. (Dkt. no. 28, at 2.) According to  
8 Plaintiff, Defendants had thus far declined Plaintiff's requests  
9 for the needed evidence - the loan application "executed and/or  
10 approved by the parties and at issue in this case." (Id.)  
11 Plaintiff asks this Court to stay Defendants' Motion and allow  
12 limited discovery for the purpose of obtaining the underlying loan  
13 application. (Id. at 4.)

14 On January 19, 2016, Defendants filed a Response to  
15 Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time. (Dkt. no. 32.)  
16 Defendants argue against early discovery, stating that they  
17 provided Plaintiff with the loan application that day. (Id. at 2;  
18 Saelao Decl., Dkt. no. 32-1, at 1.) Defendants do not otherwise  
19 oppose Plaintiff's Motion for an Extension of Time for Plaintiff to  
20 respond to Defendants' Motion for a More Definite Statement. (Id.)

21 The Court denies Defendants' Motion because, while the  
22 Complaint may be sparse on details of exactly what contractual  
23 provision is alleged to be breached, the essential elements of a  
24 breach of contract are all pled with sufficient facts given the  
25 information available to Plaintiff at this time.

26 The Court, however, declines Plaintiff's request for limited  
27 discovery as to the loan application. Normal discovery will  
28 proceed following the parties' Rule 26 meeting. Plaintiff then

1 will receive the needed evidence, if any, to make a more definite  
2 statement. Therefore, the Court DENIES Defendants' Motion. (Dkt.  
3 no. 26.) The Court VACATES as moot Plaintiff's Motion. (Dkt. no.  
4 28.)

5  
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7  
8 Dated: February 1, 2016



9 DEAN D. PREGERSON  
10 United States District Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28